

	Concord, NH	
District of Merrimack NH		Docket # CV-00748-SM
Favorite Things		
a DBA		
Natasha Athens		
v.		
Bank of America et al		
Megan Scholz		
Defendants		

PLAINTIFF'S RESPONSE TO JUDGE'S ORDER ON SUMMONS
QUESTION OF NEED FOR RECUSAL,
<https://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/28/455>

The Plaintiff put the addressses of Defendant Megan's letterhead, and it's even a fraudulent act on herself if she is not working at that location and that branch and sending out letterhead to customers with false information.

Through a private investigator, the Plaintiff obtained enough addresses and private data on Defendant Megan, and Brian to figure out their assets since they are changing loan amounts on their customers.

The PLAINTIFF is obtaining this same Private Investigator data on everyone that is part of this case, from judges to Defendants and their lawyers.

The bais on the court so far is blatant, and the court is treating the Plaintiff as though she is a criminal Defendant, when actually it's the reverse.

Since the court has stalled the filing and service of this case, failed to read the complaint with accuracy, given the "Defendant's" additional time to respond, which are NO WHERE in court rules, and the court is stalling on return of unserved notice and then putting in the 90 day time clock on being served, when they absorbed 40 days of that clock, the Plaintiff has to ascertain the reasons for the court bias and failure to lawfully act upon notice of country wide bank fraud.

The Plaintiff gets to present to the court, the character of a lawyer that thinks she's above the law, has criminal and potential criminal issues on her record, simply indicating that she thinks laws don't apply to her, even while driving on the road, and that she can use title and position to do things like change loan amounts perhaps because Bank of America holds her home loan, and she feels beholden to do things based on that conflict of interest.

All of the records obtained on every single party that disregards the rule of law in this matter becomes a party to the crime spree from these Defendants.

Megan's Auto is listed as one of the addresses in the Summons, and if she dodges service at her place of employment, the Sheriff's have additional data to serve her. If the Sheriff's fail to serve both parties, then the Plaintiff is having the parties served by private detective.

The Sheriff's failed to give the required addresses for service to the Plaintiff, even though they knew them and have been serving Bank of America lawsuits due to these crimes of bank fraud.

A Defendant only gets 21 days written right on the Summons to respond to a lawsuit, the prior judicial order allowed for 30 days, again, stalling the urgency of this case.

The Plaintiff is allowed to have a hearing prior to service, especially since the court was not doing their jobs to proceed with this case, and Judge Johnstone has 0 impartiality when it comes to the Plaintiff.

Since the court failed to allow the Plaintiff her right to a hearing on status, and other issues in the case, the Plaintiff put them in public videos and will be hoping that in the future, the court will hold hearings as required by law.

If anyone wants to recuse themselves, or is in conflict with their own status because they are a Bank of America customer, or their paycheck comes from Bank of America, they are required to recuse themselves from this matter.

The Plaintiff is obtaining data on every party for the bias that has been shown already, and for the failure to protect the Plaintiff and her right to a 100%

forgiven loan. Since Judge Johnstone failed to list in her extended 30 day assessment of the case and failed to act upon request for an urgent hearing, but has instead added time that is based on no law, and cut into the 90 day timeframe for service of the summons, her partisan stance comes into a question of recusal.

Response to Judge Johnstone order

<https://www.bitchute.com/video/EdO7kuy23WU3/>

Bank of America dodging Summons

<https://www.bitchute.com/video/45ktAzWafQan/>

The Plaintiff has a right to this loan being forgiven as does every other business owner. There is no "appeal" to the SBA and Judge Johnstone knows this, that's part of the fraud, but she failed to call out the Defendant for lying and trying to set up the Plaintiff and unsuspecting business owners with a liar (Defendant Megan Scholz) on Bank Letterhead.

The court will have to hold a hearing with the Defendant who will have to answer to her altering the Plaintiff's loan forgiveness application and explain where the criminal indictment of the Plaintiff is for not being entitled to a loan and or mispending the funds. Since that did not happen, and the Defendant was stupid enough, on Bank of America letterhead, to "call it a Bank" error, this should have been stated in the review of Judge Johnstone, and clearly seeking answers as to why.

The Plaintiff has the right to make sure that all parties in this case are not involved in covering up this crime, or failing at their duties. The reason that the Plaintiff filed so many criminal reports, as well as civil, and the BAR, is that too much dirty money changes hands to prevent the truth from surfacing.

The Defendant's can still submit the corrected forgiveness application, as there is not a chance that the Plaintiff is accepting \$1.00 forgiveness, and Megan herself owns more than 1 property, and will have to come up with the damages due the Plaintiff for failing to put her loan through to forgiveness. The Defendant Megan Scholz, will also be billed for every single fee to the private investigators, and she

should hope that don't have to go and serve her, since that bill starts at \$600. per person.

The court needs to be a non-party to this case, including family that has any accounts at Bank of America, since when the data comes from the private investigator, it will list all relatives, and associates, and the Plaintiff can then obtain their data and their investments, and their bank accounts or loans.

The Plaintiff formally requests lawful recusal of any party that has a connection to the Defendant or a bias held for any other reason, and that they make this recusal prior to the money is spent on a private investigator.

/s/ Natasha Athens
Favorite Things

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE TO Brian Moynihan, and Megan Scholz
on October 14, 2021 via their emails on record already.